

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL,

OF

Politics and General Literature.

VOL. V.]

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1821.

[No. 253.

SUMMARY OF NEWS.

—235—

Politics of Europe.

Neither the Shipping Report of yesterday, nor the Dawn from Madras, has added to our European Intelligence, so that we fulfil our pledge in giving a part of our Paper of to-day to such portions of the Debate in the India House on the 4th of April, as relate to the Indian Press.

The Debate occupies twenty-five pages of closely printed matter in the *Asiatic Journal* for May; but we have not thought it necessary to reprint the whole, more particularly as the general merits of Mr. Canning, for the impartial administration of a difficult office, as President of the Board of Control, does not seem to be questioned. On the subject of the Freedom of the Press, it was fair to presume, from Mr. Canning's known political sentiments, that if any well-grounded objection could have been made to it, such an objection would have found an advocate in him: It is therefore particularly gratifying, and ought to be most convincing to all impartial minds, to find that on this question,—namely, the Benefits of a Free Press to India, and the complete sufficiency, or competency of the Courts to check and punish all abuses of this Freedom, without the recurrence to any other Restrictions than those enjoined by the Law of England,—there existed in the Board of Control, the Court of Directors, and that of the Proprietors, the most entire and perfect unanimity. Whatever differences of opinion were entertained about the propriety of a Vote, or a Pension, or any other testimony of respect to Mr. Canning, when the Freedom of the Indian Press was spoken of, all concurred in eulogizing it, as fraught with advantages to both to the Governors and Governed.

It must be remembered too, that this was the unopposed sentiment of a Public Court of India Proprietors, composed of Military and other Officers to whom the true and exact character of the Indian Press was most intimately known. All the Speakers on this occasion, had possessed the fullest opportunities of forming a correct estimate of the use that had been made in Calcutta of this Liberty of the Press, since the Censorship had been removed. They are in the constant habit of seeing the very Paper which has been so loudly censured here as abusing that Liberty for vile and factious purposes; and they know well the pains that have been taken to cast an odium on the Free Press of India, by those to whom its searching and salutary influence was most obnoxious.

At the moment of this Debate *at home*, the Speakers were well acquainted with the most grievous offences ever committed by the Calcutta Press, and which will perhaps never be forgiven by the parties most deeply wounded *here*,—we mean the Comments on the Letter of An Englishman—the Observations on the late Governor of Madras—the Vestry Struggle—the Letter of One of the Many—the Boat Office Libel—and sundry other grievous wounds, which Public Decency, Social Order, Civil Subversion, and all that is sacred and valuable among us, are said to have received at our guilty hands!

Yet with all these damning proofs before them, of the “turbulence of faction,” the “sedition, treason, and blasphemy,” that other microscopic eyes could discover, as having “fomented bitter and sanguinary animosities, tending to shake the established order of things by scattering the firebrands of discord and discontent around”—with exactly the same materials before them as those from which this character had been drawn of the Indian Press,—

these enlightened and liberal Englishmen *all* agreed that the Indian Press should be Free, and that it could neither shake the security of a good Government, nor weaken the bonds of a civilized and moral people, to have it entirely unfettered.

But, we might ask, is the splendid and unanswerable Eulogium of Lord Hastings himself, on “the Freedom of Publication as a natural right of his fellow-subjects,” so soon forgotten? Were those lofty sentiments, which all men who had the happiness to hear, professed a wish to have engraven on their hearts for ever, written only in water or on sand? The day will come, when these will appear on the page of History and win the admiration of Britons yet unborn, in spite of all, the efforts made by the enemies of the Press to fritter them away by unmeaning conditions, and to lessen their excellency by insinuating that they were not sincere. When the statue of the second Hastings shall adorn this City of Palaces, whatever may be the Inscription on its pedestal, these memorable words at least will find a place on some portion of the scroll; and till then, we think they should be suspended on golden tablets—in the Council Chamber—in the Courts of Justice—in the Temples of Devotion—in the Halls of Entertainment—in the Highways of the most Public Places—and in the Libraries of every Private Dwelling.

As persons who look into Newspapers only for the passing information of the day, and often for mere amusement, run them over in a cursory manner, or at least cannot be expected to study them with that care and attention which those whose business it is to collect and arrange intelligence for publication are obliged to use, we think it our duty to take the trouble of shewing the arts that are practised by some of the pretended Models of the Calcutta Press. After this specimen, we shall leave it to the good sense of the Public to determine, whether it be not necessary that at least one Paper should exist in India sufficiently free to point out such misrepresentations.

The *Government Gazette* of Thursday (after placing the affairs of the freedom-seeking Greeks in as unfavourable a light as possible) ushers in, with great pomp, some extracts from an Address to the King, said to be written and circulated by Lord Lauderdale, which, he says “puts to flight the stupid common-places, respecting the increase of corruption.”

After giving as much of these extracts as suited his purpose, he foists in amongst them, without any division of subject, extracts from an article published in the *John Bull* of the 17th instant, and passes them all off as the sentiments of Lord Lauderdale!

As a proof that the bait was admirably well prepared, we have only to mention that the Editor of the *Hurharn*, who ought to have kept a sharper look out, has been completely taken in by it. We will not flatter the Public, however, by putting their understanding on a level with this profound Editor (not to use his own choice epithet), nor will we pay him the compliment to say that he intended to delude others, when the fact is that he was deceived himself. We mention this circumstance merely to show, that as a person who sets himself up to read the Public a Daily Lecture on the British Constitution, possesses such accommodating credulity, it is *possible* that some of his enlightened readers may also be deceived. This sage Editor, in the plenitude of his wisdom, ushers in with great triumph the pretended sentiments of Lord Lauderdale, copying them in the gross from the *Government*

Gazette, and joying much that such sentiments are (as he supposes) sanctioned by such a name; and thus again with consummate complacency, he passes off at second-hand this adulterated composition upon the Public! We think it sufficient to have pointed out this trick, and may now safely leave the authors of it to their own thoughts.

The Editor of the *Hurkru* goes farther still, however; he proceeds to make profound speculations on this spurious article, in order to confute the "silly assertions of the *Journal*." We apprehend it would be tiring our readers, to notice at any length the observations of a Writer who seems striving to bring the Indian Press into disrepute. When Common Sense, however, is defied, we cannot refrain from attempting a few words in its defence.

In making some observations on the atrocious massacre at Manchester, in our Paper of the 13th instant, we expressed an opinion, that the refusal of the House of Commons to institute an investigation into that affair, was a proof that the sympathy, WHICH OUGHT TO EXIST between the People and the House of Commons, no longer remains; and taking this fact as demonstrated, it was added, "We may safely say, that the most valuable part of the British Constitution is no more." We are now told by the Editor of the *Hurkru*, that (*Hurkru*, Sept. 14) "Public Opinion (our expression was—sympathy between the House of Commons and the People)—forms no part of the British Constitution,—no component part of it." Is it no part of the British Constitution that the People should have a voice in the making of the Laws, by which they are governed? that their voice shall be heard through the House of Commons, in which they are represented? and is it no part of the Constitution, therefore, that these Representatives should be animated with a desire to promote the wishes and interests of their Constituents? We reiterate our assertion: we affirm that this is the Chief Corner Stone of the Constitution, and the only sure Bulwark of our Liberties; nay more, that this is the essence and foundation of every Representative System of Government, and that when this SYMPATHY, this vital principle of Constitutional Liberty is feeble, or extinct, in our own country, then, of a truth, THE MOST VALUABLE PART OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION IS NO MORE.

We thus expressed, and we now repeat our opinions, and the reasons on which we found them; and we are confident that these opinions are entertained also by a great majority of our readers, who do not expect us to explain them daily to an Editor, whom it would be requisite to furnish not only with *reasons*, but also with a *capacity to understand them*,—which is beyond our province, as well as our power—and "is not in the bond."

The Constitution we are told consists of "King, Lords, and Commons;" but who are the Commons? Not the Ministerial Majority; not the Whig Opposition; these are merely the Representatives of the Commons! The Commons are the whole body of the People who are under the rank of Peers. The Legislature is indeed entrusted to three distinct powers: the King, Lords, and the House of Commons; but what does it signify to the People to be told that "the several branches of the Legislature stand in the same relation to each other, that they have done ever since the present Royal Family sat on the throne?" The Commons answer, "We see that you are all on very good terms with each other; the greatest harmony subsists between you, especially between our House or branch of the Legislature, and the Ministers of the Crown; and we are satisfied that you take very good care of your own respective privileges; but our great complaint is that our Representatives,—we mean those who sit in our House—and whose duty it is to take care of our rights and interests, instead of speaking out in our behalf, and standing our Friend, when pinched for want, or roughly treated by Manchester Yeomanry,—these our Representatives, we say, refuse to enquire into our grievances, and turn a deaf ear to our complaints." Can this be called an efficient Representation of the People in Parliament? Is a body so acting likely to vindicate and protect the rights and interests of the Commons of England?

Government in Ireland.—Nothing can equal the audacity with which the most gross frauds seem to be now practised by the creatures of Government in Ireland. The High Sheriff of Dublin, in converting an insignificant Minority into a Majority, has only, it would appear, followed the precedent set him by the Mayor of Carrickfergus. At a meeting of the Inhabitants of Carrickfergus and neighbourhood, a few days before, a Loyal Address of the usual description was proposed, which met with a very unfavorable reception. The Mayor, greatly incensed at this, threatened at first to dissolve the meeting, and left the Chair; but upon better thoughts, he remained and put the question. The numbers who voted against the Address were as 8 to 1, but the Mayor pronounced, nevertheless, that it was carried. And accordingly in all the Treasury Prints, the Address in question passes as the act of this legally convened Meeting.

And these acts are committed under the pretence of a regard to Religion and the Laws! This pretence is now pretty well understood throughout the country. The real enemies to religion and the laws have taken good care to unmask themselves. When they are seen exhibiting, in so barefaced a manner, an utter disregard to truth and honesty, they can deceive none but those who are determined to be deceived. There are many, we should hope, of those who have hitherto supported Ministers, who cannot fail to disapprove of conduct like this—which is calculated to destroy all respect for, and confidence in, public men, and to loosen the ties by which society is held together. All the good must unite to stem this torrent of fraud, hypocrisy, and immorality, and prevent Ministers and their venal adherents from involving all that is valuable among us in one common ruin.

It is to the strong regard for religion and morals, possessed by the great body of the people of this country, that we trust for the destruction of this system. Ministers may boast of their regard for the purity of morals, and the Treasury Prints may continue, with matchless assurance, to lament, day after day, the spread of irreligion in the country, but the people judge of them by their actions, and not their professions. The people are not irreligious, and only lament to see that they who raise this cry about religion, are so little alive to its precepts. It was well observed at the Fife Meeting, that those who denounced the people as irreligious, were almost the only persons who absented themselves from churches, and neglected public worship. The yeomanry and labouring people in Scotland, and we have little doubt that the observation may be extended to England, were declared, without contradiction, to be exemplary in the discharge of their religious duties, and regular attenders at Church, while the pews of the Gentry were generally empty.

What can be more nauseous to all persons sincerely imbued with a regard for religion than the indignation which *The Courier* day after bay affects to feel at the pretended profanation of Christmas-day in Chester? This profanation consisted in certain Benefit Societies parading through that City on the day in question in honour of the Queen. "That such an indecent spectacle," says *The Courier*, "was suffered to be exhibited, reflects, we think, very little credit upon the Magistrates of Chester, who ought to have known that it was their duty to interpose, and to prevent any public procession on a day sacred to holy purposes." If the Magistrates of Chester had interposed to do any such thing, they would have been guilty of a most unwarrantable infringement on the liberties of their fellow-subjects. Why should they stop any procession on Christmas-day? The Law has given them no power to do so. "On Christmas-day," continues the writer, "that solemn festival, which Christians hallow in commemoration of his birth, who came into the world to teach virtue, and to denounce all uncleanness." Christmas-day is a festival of the English Church, but it is not a festival of the Church of Scotland, and many of the Dissenting Churches in this part of the Island. To force men to observe a festival not of their own religion, but of another religion, would be a piece of intolerance altogether at variance with the liberality of the present times. The Sectaries owe obedience to the Laws, but they owe no obedience to the rules of a Church to which they do not belong. But we are almost ashamed at our having taken so much notice of such a subject.—*Morning Chronicle*.

Saturday, September 22, 1821.

—237—

English Press.

ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN, AND THE STATE OF THE PUBLIC PRESS IN ENGLAND.

(From the *Durham Chronicle*.)

Many years have elapsed since it was declared in the House of Commons, and a motion entered on the Journals to that effect, "That the power of the Crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished." Since that period, no checks having been applied, the influence of the Crown, by an increased expenditure, and a proportionate accumulation of the national debt, has been vastly increased; and it is lamentable to observe, that during the whole of the last reign, our "faithful Commons" have not, as in former periods of our history, possessed any other than a nominal control over the public burdens. Hence the great increase of taxation, of public burdens, of the distress of all the useful classes, on which the wealth of the nation depends, and of general complaint and disaffection. *Josephus* says, that "Moses required a King should be limited in his Revenue, lest he become so potent, that his State be inconsistent with the general welfare." Lib. 4. c. 8. Besides having the appointment of the principal officers of the sea and land forces, our King is also head of the Church and the disposer of its chief patronage, amounting to eight or ten millions annually, and the appointing to all Ambassadors, Ministers, Judges, Magistrates, Excise and Custom-house Officers; ruling the East and the West, and concentrating in himself the chief authority, as well as the Revenues of the Colonies. Add to these advantages the receipt of seventy millions, and the re-payment of immense sums, in the shape of salaries, pensions and sinecures—thus exercising a double influence every year on the larger half of the entire Revenue. The King, while he is personally the source of all honours and dignities, is himself one branch of the Legislature, and creator of the second; with the power of assembling, proroguing, and dissolving both Houses of Parliament by his simple pleasure. Who then can pretend to a knowledge of the extent of the Revenues, the power, or the influence of the Crown of England?—What therefore, can the people, individually trivial and dispersed, effect against such overwhelming authority, by which the Crown commands so many classes of society, by their prejudices, their vanities, and their necessities?

But the most deplorable application of this influence, is in corrupting the Public Press, the Palladium of our Liberties. It is notorious that a great majority of those who write for Administration have been won from the popular cause by bribes, by pensions, or by places.—"I believe," says Mr. ENSOR, "that there is scarcely a single editor of a public print favourable to Government, who is not paid by place, pension, or gratuity, or stipulated business; nor is any author enlisted under the same banners without actual provision from Government, or large expectations."

Convinced, therefore, that the liberties and prosperity of the people of this country depend chiefly on the Liberty of the Press, and that the success of a corrupt Administration must always depend upon their ability to corrupt and prevent it from its legitimate end—the dissemination of truth—it behoves every Englishman to be jealous of any infringement of its rights and privileges. On a late occasion the importance of the Press, in giving furtherance and effect to the popular voice, has been powerfully demonstrated; and the triumph of the Queen and the people, it will not be doubted, was owing principally to its agency.

As the popular press has of late been so eminently successful in defeating the schemes of tyranny and oppression, in some of the most odious forms, so has the base and corrupt press laboured incessantly to undermine the morality and sap the foundation of the liberties of our country. It is greatly to be regretted that Reformers of any class should in the smallest degree countenance, or lend their aid and support to such prints, not adverting to the evil consequences attendant on such conduct. Whilst the superficial are led to consult them from a mere idle curiosity, and the more opulent of the Reformers are persuaded to support them by their advertisements, the man of generous and noble sentiments, ardent in his country's cause, is discouraged, and the mean, servile tool of despotic power is supported and rewarded. Those prostituted channels of perfidy and falsehood, which are bribed by the people's money to betray and slander them, ought not to be countenanced by men of patriotic views; the object of such prints clearly is to impede the moral progress of man, on which his happiness ultimately depends, by arresting the knowledge of the age, and preventing the propagation of true principles of *legislation, law, and government*.

The differences amongst real Patriots and Reformers should all be merged in the consideration of the necessity of their union against the interested and greedy faction at present devouring the vitals of the state, and who, unfortunately for the people, wield the resources and destinies

of this great empire. The enemies of the people are powerful principally from their combination and agreement in sharing the produce of the national wealth; and are dividing the spoils, while the Patriots are contending and separating themselves from each other on points of no practical importance, greatly to the detriment of the public cause, and the advantage of the enemy. Could Reformers of all classes be once induced to combine their forces (their moral power and influence) for the salvation of their country, there is no doubt the effect would be irresistible: as every Government must ultimately depend for its support on the power of Public Opinion.

Indian Press.

EAST INDIA HOUSE, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1821.

MR. CANNING, AND THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN INDIA.

(Extracted from the *Asiatic Journal*)

The CHAIRMAN.—"I am now to acquaint the Court, that it has been made special in consequence of an intimation having been given by a proprietor, at the general Court held on the 21st ultimo, of his intention to submit to the proprietors a motion, founded on a letter addressed by the chairman and deputy chairman of the Court of Directors to the right hon. George Canning, dated the 22d December last."

Mr. R. JACKSON.—"Perhaps you will have the goodness to order the letter of the Court of Directors and Mr. Canning's answer to be read."

The two letters (for which see the *Journal* of the 4th instant, page 29.) were accordingly read.

Mr. R. JACKSON, before he formally submitted the resolution he had to propose, wished to make an observation on what had fallen from a gallant officer (Col. Stanhope) whose acquiescence, on this occasion, he very much coveted. At the last Court that honourable proprietor had stated, that he would not feel himself quite disposed to concur in any vote of thanks, until he had received some information with regard to Mr. Canning's conduct on a very delicate point, namely, the course he pursued towards the Asiatic Press, on which subject that gallant officer had intimated his intention of moving for certain papers. Without affecting to know whether such papers did really and formally exist, or, if they did, how far it would be wise to lay them before a public Court, they had (Mr. Jackson observed) the satisfaction of knowing, through another public medium, namely, the House of Commons, how the fact stood. Not long since, when Mr. Bathurst, the new President of the Board of Control, was rather challenged with having taken away that Freedom which the Marquis of Hastings was said to have given to the Asiatic Press, the right honourable gentleman gave a very plain answer on the subject. Mr. Bathurst, it must be observed, could at the time speak only to what had happened during the administration of his predecessor, Mr. Canning, and his answer was, "that no dispatch for restraining the Freedom of the Press in India had been sanctioned by or proceeded from the Board of Control: and, according to the best of his judgement and belief, it was not intended to send out any such dispatch." (hear, hear.) He could only refer to the answer given by the successor of Mr. Canning; but his honourable friend (Mr. Home), who, from his elevated situation in another place, had an opportunity of knowing those matters better than men who moved in so obscure a sphere as himself, had stated, when the question was before introduced, that, so far from being favourable to an obstruction of the Asiatic Press, Mr. Canning had expressed his decided intention to oppose the renewal of any restriction. With these observations, perhaps he might venture to hope that one point of the precedent, in the case of Lord Melville, would be this day followed, namely, that the resolution should meet the general approbation of the Court, and be passed unanimously. (hear, hear.) They all knew that unanimity did impart a sort of charm,—did give a degree of credit, of weight, of acceptability to public acts of this kind, and he hoped it would not now be withheld. (hear, hear.) He had at least endeavoured to deserve the general concurrence of the Court, by fastidiously abstaining from the introduction of any topic that was calculated to provoke discussion of an adverse nature; and he had drawn up the resolution in such a way, that every man who believed Mr. Canning had to have been an able, faithful, zealous and honourable Indian minister, might support it without any reference to political opinions. The learned gentleman concluded by moving.

"That this Court, most cordially concurring in the sentiments expressed by the Court of Directors, in their letter of the 22d of December last, to the right hon. George Canning, assure that gentlemen of their sincere admiration of those high qualities, so emphatically noticed and so unanimously recorded by the executive government of this Company, and request him to accept of this expression of their great respect, and of their well-entitled wishes for his health and happiness, whether acting as a distinguished servant of the public, or enjoying the calmer pleasures of private life."

Mr. PERRY said, he rose with great pleasure to second the motion of his hon. and learned friend; and after so able and so eloquent an address as that with which he had prefaced his motion, he felt that it would not be necessary for any person to enter into an elaborate argument, as an apology for not adding much to what his learned friend had stated, or increasing the powerful effect which his speech had produced. He was aware, that perhaps the seconding of the resolution would come with more propriety and more grace from some gentleman of greater consideration in that court, rather than from so humble an individual as he was; but it happened, from the public circumstances of his life, that there were facts connected with the motion which made it peculiarly necessary that he should express his heartfelt approbation of the proposition submitted to the Court by his learned friend. His long connection with the periodical Press* led him thus openly to declare the gratitude which he, in common with all those who duly appreciated the blessings of a Free Press, must ever feel towards the right hon. George Canning, for the conduct which he had pursued with respect to the Press of India. That circumstance had been very properly alluded to by his learned friend; and the countenance which, it appeared, the right hon. gent. had given to the Asiatic Press, weighed so forcibly on his mind, that he trusted he would be excused for presenting himself to that special court, and delivering his sentiments on a question of so much interest.

Every thinking man must agree with him, that, next to the light of Religion, the Liberty of the Press was most essential to the happiness of the human race. The Liberty of the Press was as necessary to happiness here as the light of Revelation was to eternal happiness hereafter. The Freedom of the Press in India appeared to him to be most favourable to the best interests of the Company, while, at the same time, it secured the happiness of the many millions of Natives who lived under their beneficent government. It was perfectly well known that the Press in India was placed in the hands of two distinct orders of men; the one, an enlightened race, native-born British subjects, living under the sway of the Company; the other order, the half-cast Indian, or mixed native race, who were comparatively uninformed. Over the Press, in the hands of the former, the coercing, paralyzing, subduing power of the Censorship had been suspended. That appalling power was now happily abolished; but while it existed there was, there could be, no Liberty of the Press. On the other hand, the Native Press was subject only to the visitation of the Courts of Law, as in England; it was amenable only to that salutary correction, which should always be applied, when the Liberty of the Press degenerated into licentiousness—when that great engine of Public Opinion was disgraced and degraded by private scandal, by licentious libel, by sedition, or by blasphemy. (*hear, hear.*) What was the consequence of this system? Why it created this anomaly, that the Press in India was absolutely forbidden to the intelligent, enlightened, and liberal part of the community, while it was open to the half-informed and unenlightened portion;—yes, it was open to that body of men, who were likely, by their half-knowledge, by their superficial information, to spread disaffection, and disseminate every thing that was licentious throughout the country; whereas it was wholly shut against those in whose hands it would have been subservient to all the purposes of good government and of public happiness; for it must be recollect, that in all cases it was from half-knowledge, from half-information, from that superficial trifling which they might witness amongst the reformers of foreign countries, that danger was to be apprehended. It was that deficiency of knowledge which created mischief. The full blaze of intelligence never produced an ill effect; it never shook the security of a government, or weakened the morality of a people. The hon. proprietor concluded by expressing his hearty concurrence in the motion.

Colonel STANHOPE concurred in all that had fallen from the hon. proprietor who had just spoken on the subject of the Asiatic Press; he did so from a conviction that it was calculated, more than any other measure, to secure the happiness and promote the interests, not only of sixty millions of our fellow-subjects, but likewise the interests of all those nations who lived within the wide sphere of the Company's influence. He agreed, also, with the learned mover of the resolution, in considering that great merit was due to Mr. Canning for the appointment of Mr. Elphinstone and Sir T. Munro to the governments of Bombay and Madras; for there was no mode in which the President of the Board of Control could render such essential service to the state, as by selecting able and honest men to fill those high offices. Their power was, in fact, so great, that the interests of those under their rule mainly rested on their active virtue. Sir T. Munro possessed great zeal, experience, and vigour of intellect; and he had the rare merit of feeling a strong, ardent, he would almost say a prejudiced attachment, to the people over whom he was sent to govern. This with him (Col. Stanhope) was a merit of the first order. With respect to the Munro system, it had great merits as well as great defects. The union of the duties of magistrate and collector was so contrary to all wise maxims of policy, so condemned by all writers on government,

that it ought not to be tolerated. To place in the same hands the power of assessing the lands, of collecting the revenues and of sitting as magistrate in judgment over offenders, was absurd; it was, in every point of view, extremely objectionable. Those duties were quite incongruous, and therefore it might be deemed a monster in government. (*hear, hear.*) No man should sit in judgment over his own acts. "The power (observed Aristotle) of collecting the revenue ought never to belong to the same persons who administer justice and punish crime, lest the judicial administrator should abuse his authority to the base purposes of extortion and vengeance." The revenue system was admirable, if meant to ascertain a precise knowledge of the value of fields, and other information on that subject preparatory to that which was dearest to every man's heart, he meant a permanent property in the land; but if intended as a substitute for that wise and laudable measure, it could not be too much condemned. The establishment of native courts and native agency had done vast good; it had completely cleared the files of the courts of that arrear of causes which was so detrimental to public justice. With respect to Mr. Elphinstone, he was one of the most distinguished men ever sent out from this country to India; distinguished for every public and every social virtue; distinguished as an oriental scholar, as a diplomatist, as a traveller, an author, and a chivalrous soldier. As governor, it might be asked by this scrutinizing country, "what has he done?" Why, he would tell the Court what he had done. The very first act of his administration was to abolish the odious, the hateful Censorship of the Press. For sanctioning these appointments, then, Mr. Canning had a right to claim great merit. The learned mover, too, had given him to understand that Mr. Canning, so far from taking any measure hostile to the Asiatic Press, had prevented the restoration of the Censorship. When he said that that right honourable gentleman had prevented the restoration of the Censorship, he did not mean to admit that an order from any authority could have induced the Marquis of Hastings to have restored that unjust and impolitic restriction; no, he was too wise, too noble, too great a friend of Liberty, too firm to his purpose in an honest cause, ever to have sanctioned the recurrence to such a measure. Better, far better would it be, for the Marquis of Hastings to give up his government, rather than sacrifice his fame, and the character of his country, by the sanction of such an act. He should now conclude with the observation, that Mr. Canning, by promoting the permanent establishment of a Free Press in Asia, had, in that act, proved himself a Public Benefactor, and he would therefore support the motion with all his heart.—(*hear, hear, hear.*)

Mr. LOWNDES gave Mr. Canning the highest credit for being friendly to the Liberty of the Press in India, at the very time when the Press of England was abusing him; he was ten times more the advocate of the right honourable gentleman since he had heard of that trait in his character than he was before. It shewed a great and noble mind, while he was smarting under the freedom, or, more properly speaking, the licentiousness of the English Press, to overlook the slander, and exert himself in favour of the Liberty of the Press in India. When he took up a British newspaper, and read something directed against himself, his liberal mind taught him to despise it. "Shall I," he would say, "though assailed and calumniated by the English Press, put down that of India? No—I love the Liberty of the Press too well." These sentiments bespoke true nobleness and elevation of mind. He also gave due credit to the honourable proprietor (Mr. Perry), for his conduct on this occasion: he, like Mr. Canning, had proved that he possessed an enlarged and liberal mind. The course pursued by Mr. Canning with respect to the Indian Press ought not only to be pointed out as worthy of imitation, but should be described in letters of gold.

The Honorable D. KINNAIRD.—As to the rumour that Mr. Canning had, in his official capacity, left with the Marquis of Hastings the power of continuing or removing the restriction on the Indian Press, he felt it necessary only to say, that, as an individual, he had always thought it proper for the government to remove the Censorship whenever it appeared that the Press in India was qualified for that purpose. As far as he was acquainted with the subject, he could not but look upon the day when the restriction was abolished as a period of the greatest interest and importance in the history of India—(*hear, hear.*) and knowing, as he did, the reasoning mind and calculating character of the Marquis of Hastings, he would say, that it augured well for the stability and security of the Company's government, when that nobleman felt it safe to remove it. (*hear, hear.*) Sure he was, that it was more easy to rule by adopting liberal principles of Government, and by manifesting and encouraging good feeling and confidence, rather than by having recourse to measures of severity and harshness.—(*hear, hear.*)

Mr. WILKES concurred in all the eulogiums that had been passed on the Liberty of the Press, and he felt that Mr. Canning's conduct, with respect to the Press of India, did not receive more praise than it deserved.

The motion was agreed to.

Colonel STANHOPE, in consequence of the length of the debate and the lateness of the hour, postponed his motion of the subject of the Asiatic Press until the next meeting of the court.—Adjourned.

* Mr. Perry has for many years been editor and proprietor of the *Morning Chronicle*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

—239—

Essay on Revolutions.

(Morning Chronicle.)

Shewing that the corruption and decline of the States of France, once the faithful and powerful organ of Public Opinion, led to the corruption, and consequently to the fall of the Court, Noblesse, and Clergy, arising from shock or collision with the Third Estate.

That the purity and independence of Parliament will alone preserve the spirit, activity, and competency to fulfil their functions, of our own Aristocracy.

“ Misguided people of the new way, beware on your side!—And you of the ancient and Established Church, injure not your neighbours and fellow citizens, who are enthusiastically led away in ignorance and mistake, rather than with design or malice.

“ ‘Tis by discourse and reason, not by blows, insults, or violence, that men are to be informed of truth, and convinced of error.”—*The Emperor Julian’s Epistles; see Lord Shaftesbury’s Character.*

The *vis medicatrix* of the sword is the agent, which the Emperor Alexander proposes to employ, in our days, in cleansing his contemporaries of their infirmities; it is with such *discourse and reason* they are to be weaned from their errors. The Emperor Julian, not less experienced or skilful, not less firm and dexterous in the application of this powerful medicament, of this all convincing logic, showed himself more accomplished proficient in the new philosophy of his own age, by adopting the sound doctrine, quoted in illustration of the opinions of this essay.

It will be attempted to show, by a review of the ancient Institutions of France, partaking, in some degree, of the barbarism of their origin in the wilds of Germany, but placed, by the contrivance of such men as Richelieu, in a state of abeyance, that their decay led to the Revolution.

Every man, whose education and understanding qualify him for serious reflection on the substantial duties exacted of him in society, according to his means and his station, feels that the doctrine of the Economists applies to himself and to every other member of the community. The principle of the division of labour assigns to him his share, in quantity and quality, of the common toil. The Aristocratical Member, decorated indeed, as the Corinthian capital, to grace the pillar of society, must contribute, equally with the Democratic base and pedestal, to sustain the common roof, by which all are sheltered and protected.

The elevated duties of society, its most sacred trusts, require, some of them at least, that those who are to discharge them, should have been almost cradled in the habits required for their exercise. The supreme Magistracy itself, the divided trust of legislation, the control of the public purse, the administration of the laws, and that most important function of the executive, the wielding of the public sword, require each of them, not only peculiar studies, habits, and attainments of the understanding, but also certain moral feelings or principles adapted to the discharge of the peculiar duties.—The steady courage or skill of the swordsman is not more important than his sense of honour and constancy to the duties of his trust; the corruptibility of the judge or advocate would render his learning, like Attorney General Noy’s doctrine of ship-money, the instrument of the subversion of that security and order, which are the fruits alone of the honest administration of the law, and of their unbiased interpretation.

Now these exalted duties constitute, together with honest and zealous, religious and moral, and the higher intellectual instruction, the most important trusts of the upper orders of society. It will be attempted, in the following observations, to show, that the ancient States of France, the ancient militia or noblesse, the ancient ecclesiastical and judicial bodies, were, however imperfect, still not wholly inefficient, and a dead letter, as some of them were, at their fall; and moreover, that the most important secret engine and instrument of the present subversion of two of these bodies, had anciently exercised its influence (ever salutary where free), with timely and wholesome admonition to the Court, the Nobles, and the Clergy; that the Institutions of France once possessed the incalculable advantages of the control exercised upon them for their benefit, by a Press, free, though young and unenlightened.

1. To the States-General of France, Machiavel ascribes, in his days, her signally good Government, prosperity, and happiness, as Montesquieu and Hume ascribed to our Laws and Constitution, the very considerable share of liberty and happiness, once enjoyed by the people of England. Harrington, in the century after Machiavel, deplored the corruption and fall of the States of France—“ While this Government was natural, and administered by the assembly of States, it is celebrated by Machiavel to have been the best ordered of any Monarchy in the world; what it is, or has been of later times, you may believe your own eyes or ears;”—*(Prerogative of Popular Government.)*

During the civil convulsions of the 16th century, those struggles for power of the Court and Aristocratical factions, to which the industry, subtlety, and firmness of Richelieu were destined to put an end at a future period; during the agitations, created by the mutual intolerance of religious sects, whom it required forty years of suffering to appease; during these scenes the States General were said to be, from some vice in their Constitution, becoming the instruments of the ruling faction. The genius of Richelieu, despotic as perfidious and unrelenting, was little disposed to brook the control of such an assembly. The Institution had been brought from the forests of Germany, by the Franks, as our own by the Saxons, according to Montesquieu’s observations; it fell gradually to decay, after having shewn, under various modifications, and during the many centuries in which it stood entire, its powerful and salutary operation. Its last fragment served almost strictly, as the very foundation stone of the Revolution, after an interval of suspension of a century and a half; the question of vote, *par ordres*, intended to have been enforced with the sword, led the heads of the Revolution and their followers to resist, with united and simultaneous movement, this attempt of the Court, Noblesse, and Clergy. As a question of sound policy and expediency, it is important to observe respecting the votes *par ordres*, that the third order or commonalty had, at this latter period, assumed a different station in society, from what it once possessed, whilst the Nobility and Clergy had lost much of their ancient weight and influence.

2. During the period of the wholesome influence of the States, and after their decline, the Noblesse formed an independent, in some degree high spirited, and practised body of militia, serving gratuitously; and under such Princes as Francis the First and Henry the Fourth, commonly with fidelity and constancy, as unshaken at their gallant resolution, “ Courage, Sire,” said a French Noble, approaching Henry the Fourth, who had exposed himself and complained that there were not fifty gentlemen left in France to support him in charging or repelling the enemy in a battle in Normandy—“ I am come to die with you.” On another occasion the King had been wounded, and would have been a prisoner; the Baron de Biron, son of the Marshal, at the head of a small band, rescued him with their pikes, keeping the enemy at bay until he escaped. Amidst these men, it is worthy of observation, there were three generations of the family of Guise: of each generation the elder son or heir was signally endowed with address and capacity, as well as heroic courage: with the ability to lead, not alone in military, but also in the civil concerns of his rank and station. There must have been something in the domestic habits and private as well as public institutions of those days, calculated to produce the fruits of the heroic age. The spirit of such men required to be controlled and directed into its proper channel. The two last expedients, for such ends, were the destruction of the States, and the substitution, in their place, of the childish imbecility of Louis Treize, the arrogance and vanity of his successor, or the profligate caprice of the grandson. It is for those, who knew the subjects and contemporaries of the latter, to say, not whether they had acquired the softer virtues, but whether in the place of the virtues of their ancestors, they had adopted those which rendered them equally efficient members of society.—The remains of the feudal spirit of the latter, and of their feudal habits, ought to have been directed to other objects, not less stimulating or noble; it ought not to have been extinguished. In the 15th century, the wars of the two Roses preserved the martial habits of the English, after the fuel of the French wars had ceased. The Tudors contrived (the first of them), gaigned and conducted (the second and the last of them) into their proper channel, the public security, this restless spirit of our ancient nobility. After an interval of one peaceful reign, the sword, again unsheathed in civil contention, conducted them to the constant acquisition of that prize, for the enjoyment of whose fruits we are, even yet, bound to reverence and bless their memory. By substantiating their claims to be the guardians of the property and liberty of their countrymen, our Lords and Commons secured to themselves a better *areæ* than that of Warwick, the King-maker; to their posterity (if these follow temperately the spirit of their example, and restore their impaired institutions), they secured (to the upper orders) the noblest field for the exercise of the faculties of man; to the middle and lower orders, protection and security, together with the amusing spectacle of watching, or condemning the conduct and the motives of their superiors, and together with the power (or some share of it) of effectual control; if a Reform of Parliament be not “ *Vox et praeterea nihil*,” an echo or phantom.

3. The ancient ecclesiastical establishment of France, with the exception of the schism of Huguenots, had lost, at the period to which we have referred, no part of its control over the minds of men. It is apparent, in the deliberations of the States, in the defences (from siege) of Paris and Rouen, that the Catholics were sincere and zealous, devoted followers of their pastors.

Whatever may have been the wealth, influence, habits, and numbers of the Clergy, at the period of the Revolution, the schisms among the people had increased; the devout heresy of the Huguenot had been exiled indeed, but its place, occupied by the cold and heartless atheism

of the profligate, or the blind and stupid zeal of the devotee, regulated, whether in the profligacy or their devotion by the blood and pulse, or by the continuance or cessation of the capacity to sin and enjoy.

The efforts of some of their philosophers, were not to correct and modify, but to extinguish—not to regulate, but to destroy, religious principles. In the mean time, the revenues of the Church, its ceremonies and outward forms, were perfect and entire; its substantial duties, alone, of vigilant and zealous admonition and instruction, appear to have been suspended.

4. The Parliaments of France (their Courts of Judicature) have ever maintained and deserved great authority in the State. It is important to attend to their influence, because during the suspension of the States at all times, their respective Parliaments served the cities and provinces, in some degree, as the *locum tenentes* of the former.

It is well known that during the final and permanent suspension of this assembly, the Parliaments, of Paris particularly, attempted to assume one of its functions, the control or check of the Royal, or Ministerial authority. "The King," says Grin, "*en bottes fortes, le fonce le main*, caused his Edict to be registered. The collision of the royal with the parliamentary authority is among the causes enumerated, with admirable sagacity, by Lord Chesterfield, of an event, which he saw to be impending and inevitable. *Les dames de la Cour*, besides, of Lord Chesterfield's day, were no longer the mothers of those men, who had dared to elbow and defy the royal person, and his prerogatives. The vice at which Tiberius sickened, had corrupted and degraded them.

It is well known to those, who have studied French Bibliography, or who have entered deeply into its literature, that the Press of France, during the 16th, and early part of the 17th centuries, teemed with the pamphlets and dissertations of the political factions, as well as religious sects. The Censorship supplanted this salutary practice. By the latter practice, phials, containing the dangerous sublimate, the poison of forbidden doctrines in religion or of exalted polities, were stripped of their labels, circulated in secrecy, deposited in corners; their insidious use was overlooked, not regulated, as with us, by a careful pharmacopœia, issuing, from time to time, from the Colleges of the learned: ecclesiastics, nobles, and, as we should say, citizens, or the *bourgeoisie*, were equally misled, or corrupted.

These, among others, appear to the writer of this Essay, to have been the gradual steps, as well as remote causes of the French Revolution. The fall of our own Constitution, if it be doomed to fall, must be ascribed to two similar causes; the perpetual, though silent and gradual encroachments of the Ministers of the Crown, and the supine or guilty indifference of those, who having been lulled or corrupted, have neglected, at all times, more especially in our own, to keep their watch, against the entry into the capitol, not of Gauls indeed, but of men, resembling those wing'd watchmen (whose vigilance preserved it) in all things, besides vigilance and harmlessness.

A—E—

Rome in the Nineteenth Century.

(From the *Literary Gazette*.)

The Church of S. Sebastian is one of the seven basilicae of Rome that pilgrims visit to obtain absolution and remission of their sins.—But here were we, a parcel of poor heretics, who had visited these holy shrines in vain,—for our sins, unabolved, still stuck by us. Before we left the Church, one of its retainers begged of us, "For the holy souls in purgatory; upon which your friend — insisted upon knowing what good money could do them there. The man reluctantly replied, that the money was given to say masses for them, and that those masses shortened the period of their purgation.

What rascals these priests must be, if they know their masses will release the poor souls that are broiling in the flames, and yet they won't say them without being paid for it! Is that what they call Christian charity, I wonder?

The man pitching on his last word, only replied by recommencing his accustomed whine of *Carita, Signore! par le Anime Sante in Purgatorio! Carita!*

Mr. — then showing him a piastre, asked with great apparent seriousness and simplicity, how many souls that would take out of purgatory. The man, evidently half enraged, but unwilling to lose the money, declared he could not safely take upon him to say how many souls it would deliver from the flames, but he could aver that it would do much towards furthering the liberation of some of them.

Mr. — then began to bargain with him for the number of masses that were to be said for it; and having cheapened them from one, which he at first proposed, to four, he gave him the piece of money for the *Anime Sante*, and went away.

Such a conversation in such place, a century or two ago, I imagine, might have got our friend into a hotter situation in this world, than the *Anime Sante*, occupy in the other.

Law Report.

WATERHOUSE, ESQ. v. COL. BERKELEY.—GLOUCESTER ASSIZES.

Mr. Jervis stated the case.

The plaintiff, John Waterhouse, Esq., is the son of the late Benjamin Waterhouse, of Kingston, Jamaica, who was connected with the house of Willis and Co., bankers in London; and, in the year 1810, whilst on a visit to the Isle of Man, became acquainted with Miss Jane Lascelles Blake, eldest daughter of Captain Blake, R. N., who was for several years a resident of Gloucester. The lady was amiable and highly accomplished; and the parties being about the same age, an attachment sprung up between them, which eventually led to their union, and on the 5th of September, 1812, they were married under the sanction of the lady's parents. After remaining about three months in the Isle of Man, they visited London, whence they proceeded to Scarborough, where they lived in retirement for three years; and the happiness arising from their union was crowned by the birth of three children. In 1817 they removed to Charlton Kings, near Cheltenham, in which village Lady Wraxall, aunt to Mrs. Waterhouse, resided.

In the latter end of the month of March, 1819, whilst the plaintiff and his wife were on a short visit to Mrs. Probyn, widow of the late Governor Probyn, who had been intimately acquainted with Mrs. Waterhouse for many years, they were first introduced to the defendant, Colonel Berkeley, who made a morning call on Mrs. Probyn, previous to her leaving Cheltenham, which she did the next day.

In the middle of April following, the plaintiff was called to London by the illness of his brother, and was absent from home till the 10th of May; and from letters subsequently found in Mrs. Waterhouse's possession, and which were admitted to be in the hand-writing of the defendant, it would appear that the particular intimacy of the parties, and the circumstances upon which this action was grounded, originated in this short interval. By the evidence of some of the domestics, it was during this period that the defendant first called upon Mrs. Waterhouse, upon which occasion she gave orders that no one else should be admitted whilst Colonel Berkeley was with her. It was likewise proved that he called afterwards at different times, when similar instructions were given to the servants; and the female cook swore, that on one occasion she observed that Mrs. Waterhouse's hair and the frill about her neck were much disordered. In the July following the plaintiff went to Jersey; and soon after his return home, in August, he expressed to Lady Wraxall his distress at finding that, in consequence of some scandalous reports which had been spread abroad, Mrs. Waterhouse did not receive that attention from the Ladies of her acquaintance which she had been accustomed to. This being communicated to Mrs. Waterhouse, she asserted her own innocence, and satisfying her husband and Lady Wraxall that these reports were unfounded, the plaintiff and his wife continued to live together as before. In Jan. 1820, the plaintiff left his family and went to Bristol, where, on the 14th of February, he embarked for Jamaica, for the purpose of visiting some estates in that island. On his return home some months afterwards, information was communicated to him which left no doubt in his mind of his having been dishonoured in the person of his wife. She was then in a state of pregnancy; and on the 11th of November following was delivered of a male child.

It might be proper her to remark, that on thus leaving his wife for Jamaica, Mr. Waterhouse left her under the same protection as he had on two former occasions, with an ample provision for her maintenance during his absence. From Jamaica Mr. Waterhouse returned in July; and knowing that he had no intercourse with his wife from the 10th of January preceding, the Jury might better imagine than he was capable of describing, the agonized situation in which he was thrown, on being informed of the course which she had adopted. He went to Cheltenham, but took the precaution of avoiding the abode of his wife. He remained there three days after the communication of the painful intelligence, and then left the place, determined never to see her again. His suspicions—which were, unhappily, but too well founded—were confirmed by an intercepted letter; the contents of which, as it had come from Mrs. Waterhouse, he was not at liberty to state. It was addressed to the present defendant, in language calculated to excite sensations which he would not venture to express. The letter from Col. Berkeley to Mrs. Waterhouse was dated the 1st of May, during that absence. It was in the following terms:—

"Nothing but the fear of losing an opportunity of seeing you could induce me to write, but I am obliged to be in London on Monday. Therefore I now send. To-night, at nine, I will be in the appointed spot. If you love me, do not fail me; there is no danger."

He (Mr. Jervis) was in possession of twenty-four letters and eight notes, written by the defendant to Mrs. Waterhouse, which were obtained from that lady on the 12th December, in consequence of Mr.

Saturday, September 22, 1821.

—241—

Waterhouse with his solicitor having gone to her lodging and obtained them by means which, under the circumstances, were not to be reprobated. From these letters he had made a selection.—At length the defendant evinced the waywardness of illicit love, and in his last short and hasty notes proved that his once ardent attachment had altogether subsided. The Learned Counsel then went on to state the oral testimony with which he was provided, as to the occasional visits of the defendant to Mrs. Waterhouse—their private interviews, and the subsequent disordered appearance of the lady's dress; and, finally, made an animated and eloquent appeal to the Jury, to compensate, as much as damages could compensate, the plaintiff for the injuries which he and his helpless infant family had sustained.

The witnesses were then called, and ten letters from the Colonel were put in and read.

The only evidence offered for the defendant consisted of four letters addressed to Colonel Berkeley, which were distinctly proved to be in the hand-writing of Mrs. Waterhouse, though the character of the two first was evidently and avowably disguised. The first of these, dated April 5, 1819, in the most explicit manner declared that the writer had long nourished an uncontrollable passion for the person to whom it was addressed, though, at the same time, it affirmed a resolution not to make herself known to him, and described the efforts she had made to avoid being in his company. The others also manifested the most ardent attachment.

Mr. Jervis, in reply, expressed himself with great indignation at the defence that had been made. The defendant knew the adulterer's course, and he had been too long in the profession to scruple about protecting his purse by the sacrifice of his honour. The Learned Counsel proceeded to question very ingeniously the authenticity of the letters, and dwelt upon the infamous conduct of the defendant, who first seduced the unhappy object of his passion, and then betrayed her, if possible to still greater infamy, by urging, forsooth, that his own personal charms had induced her to lay traps for the destruction of his innocence; and that it was he, poor man! and not this unfortunate lady, who had fallen from the path of virtue!

Mr. Justice Park summed up the case with perspicuity and impartiality; and, at twelve o'clock at night, the Jury, after a few minutes' consultation, found a verdict for the plaintiff—Damages 1000L.

COLONEL BERKELEY'S LETTERS TO MRS. WATERHOUSE.

May 4, 1819.

No unkind word shall escape from me towards you. My heart is much too tender in its vibrations to allow my lips to utter, or my hand to write, anything which is calculated to give you pain. If in future you cruelly give me cause for complaint my sighs only shall be heard, grieving for the want of love and tenderness from you. Would to Heaven I had never known you! You seem daily to have obtained an influence over me, that I deemed it impossible any woman could have arrived at. You appear to have pervaded the inmost recesses of my heart, and to have touched a chord which was destined to vibrate at no common touch. You have established a sway over me, that I did not believe any woman in England but yourself could have done. Will it not give you some little pleasure to know that my thoughts wander to the sequestered spot where you now reside? I would forgo anything this place can afford for one more meeting in the lane, now so dear to my recollection; and yet at the time I almost fancied it would be our last interview. I hoped to have emancipated myself from the dangerous power which you begin to exercise over me. There appeared a coldness in your manner, which did not agree with the warmth of heart with which my fancy had clothed you. You seemed to recoil from those caresses which my soul and my lips prompted me to bestow—not to love so warmly as I had hoped; and had not your tenderness revived in some degree before I quitted you, I should have torn myself from you for ever! You were unkind to have accused me of impetuosity; it is the characteristic of a true lover to be always impetuous when at the feet of her who has overwhelmed him with tumultuous emotions. If I should cease to be impetuous, you would have just cause to suppose that you had ceased to interest me.—(Here there was an erasure of two lines) Were I engaged in my ordinary concerns, I fear it would be given up for the sake of wandering by the cottage close to the Church. I am in hopes that by the 22d or 23d of this month I shall be able to quit this place. Shall I then be admitted to see you under any circumstances? Can you not contrive to see me for two real minutes? Farewell, dear Jane. Every happiness attend you.

May 7, 1819.

Again you are unkind, dear Jane. Do you think I do not wish to be with you this week? If you had told me when we met last the desire was mutual, I would have remained at Cheltenham, in spite of the great inconvenience which might have accrued to me and my affairs. My heart is with you now, and where the heart is the body delights to be. I would not have neglected to write yesterday, but I was obliged to devote the whole of the day to my law agents. Though called daily

to the forms of business, still the wild impetuous strokes of love burst upon me; for you have so far possessed yourself, Sorceress! of my soul, that when your image is before me, I cease to have the command of my faculties. When I permit my memory to retrace some of those sweet moments of the never-to-be-forgotten second of May, I am unfit for the common concerns and occupations of my life. But are you sure that your affection is so ardent that it entitles you to know how vehemently and passionately I can love? Tell me, sweetest, after this week, where and how I shall have an opportunity of breathing at your feet those sweet vows of tenderness—those soft sighs of unalterable love so delightful to the female heart to hear, so pleasurable to the soul of man to utter. I certainly shall come to Cheltenham some time in this month. What is to be my fate? Could you not endeavour to behold me?

May 10, 1820.

I have merely time to write a line; but I must not omit to thank you for the prettiest, the tenderest letter that ever cheered an absent lover's heart. You do, indeed, know how to love with the most delicate ardour, and the possession of your affection must ever prove a sovereign balm for every wound. I begin to feel my solitary situation, and I am not ashamed of it. You ask me if I love music and poetry? Do you think I should deserve to be loved myself if I do not? There is nothing in modern language equal to *Lalla Rookh*. The exquisite tenderness of his heroine—of his fire worshippers—Paradise and Peri, and the veiled Prophet, only serves to make one feel more severely the want of that devoted love in real life which renders them so ardent. I must write, dearest, once a week. Once a fortnight is too seldom. Tell me, sweetest! shall I write? and whether I shall direct under the first initials—I mean those you first used. Think of any place, sweet love, most convenient to yourself to meet me in when I come to Charlton. No difficulty, no danger nor weariness shall keep me from your arms. Consult your own safety, and have faith in me and my devotion. THINE.

My dearest Jane—Do not alarm yourself. The reason I did not write on Tuesday last was, that I was obliged to go on that morning to see my mother, who lives about fifteen miles from London. I conceived that I should undoubtedly have returned in time for post; but unexpected business detained me. I had resolved not to write again till I heard from you, that my letters might not needlessly lie at the Post-office, as you know there is some risk in writing. I am this instant going to the Levee at Carlton-House, and have only time to say, I love. I told you on Saturday I was under the necessity of keeping the appointment.

May 10, 1819.

The severity of my letter, dearest love, was produced by a feeling which ought to be gratifying to your heart. I could not bear to hear such insinuations even from an indifferent person, much less from one my soul cherishes as its dearest treasure. You must not attend to all the idle reports you may hear of me. The world is full of those who are ever ready to invent tales to the prejudice of those whose situation in life is at all singular, or above the common level. But your last letter is the sweetest I ever received, so devoid of injurious suspicion, and has endeared you to me more tenderly dear than before. I do forget and forgive, and love with all my soul. You are wrong, because I complain of want of time to write to you, to fancy I do not wish to receive your letters; on the contrary, my sole regret is to be obliged to estrange myself, in the pursuit of business, from the delightful sensations which those letters are calculated to produce. The only consolation I enjoy is the prospect, that, by application, I may be able to emancipate myself from my heavy shackles, become free from all ties but those of love, and hasten to press thee to my fond bosom. Are these feelings that you should complain of? Feelings which overwhelm my soul with a pleasing delirium. Farewell! I hope to be at Cheltenham next week, perhaps on Wednesday. When you write again, be positive in your information. I did not comprehend whether I was to write on Thursday, or whether my letter was to be received on Thursday. To be on the safe side, I write to-day.

June 15, 1819.

I am afraid, my dear love, that a letter of mine has been lying in the Post-office for some time. I wrote, according to orders, before I received your last. Pray tell me when the departure of part of the family takes place, as you mentioned. Nothing then shall prevent my being with you. I shall write no more till I hear whether the last, directed as this is, has arrived in safety.

June 22, 1819.

You are in error, if you think, because my letters are necessarily short, that I dislike to receive long letters from you. I assure you they give me the greatest delight, and are not half long enough. Write to me, love, when the departure actually takes place.

(Date torn off.)

If you think me capable of entering into a correspondence of such nature as the present, when I am seriously contemplating marriage with another, I must request and desire that you will not write to me again; and be assured I will trouble you with no more of my letters. I can derive no pleasure in writing to one who could for an instant

suppose me guilty of such baseness; and who, of necessity, can no longer look upon me with that tender affection, that love, which she has so long professed. You little know the warmth and delicacy of that heart which you have so deeply wounded by hazarding such unworthy suspicions. If I love you at all, you will be every thing to me. I revere, I know too well how to estimate a fond woman's devotion, to attempt to gratify my affection with two objects at the same time. You have had no reason to complain of my letters. They have been all the tenderest woman could wish. They have all been dictated by the sincerest truth. Do you not remember what Rousseau says of the letter of a true lover? If you saw the multiplicity of business with which I am loaded, you would wonder how I get time to write a single line. Farewell, my still dearest Jane. Do not injure, by false suspicions, that affection which ought to be productive of the greatest mutual bliss.

July 3, 1820.

My dear Jane—I am uncertain whether I shall be able to come to Cheltenham. I have some particular business to transact; but I advise you on no account to come to London. I cannot understand why you may not communicate by letter any thing which you have to say. I shall be always most happy to offer you my advice.

P. S.—I must be at Cheltenham before the 4th of next month, if that will suit you.

My dear Jane—The box you mentioned was not reserved for any friends or even acquaintance of mine; and I have not the slightest knowledge of the persons who sat in it. How I am worried!

MRS. WATERHOUSE'S TO COLONEL BERKELEY, READ IN THE CASE FOR THE DEFENDANT.

(The following was written in a feigned hand:—)

The lost depraved wretch, who has unwillingly cherished in her bosom a guilty passion for these two years past, now adds to her guilt by confessing it to you. What fatal spell drives her to such a step her evil genius alone can tell! But if you knew half the struggles she has had during that time with an infatuation violent as unaccountable, you would pity at least as much as you would despise. In that period she has studied every method to avoid being in your society and during your stay here, has always pleaded illness as an excuse for not going any where to have the chance of meeting you; but, alas, all in vain! And what has occurred within this fortnight has increased her guilty passion to madness; and though (as far as the most determined resolution could go) you shall never discover who the guilty wretch is that now writes to you, yet the most tender of hearts beats for you, and that she may still look on that enchanting form, unnoticed as before.—Shew this to no one; it will answer no end, being so totally disguised as to render it utterly useless in discovering the writer. Oh, should you discover her, too well does she know her fate! But if she did survive that, believe her, the breath of surmise from an ill-natured world would be her death-warrant; and, it is said, the Berkeleys are not content without publishing their triumphs to that world. Can you possess such a mind?

March 20th.

(Also in a feigned hand.)

Fold up a sheet of paper as a letter, and put 'Yes,' or 'No,' in it, meaning whether you will be at the Rooms next Monday or not; direct it with the two first letters of Affectation, and the most wicked and most miserable of women will act accordingly. But beware of putting any thing like a name in it, as it might be my destruction and death.

April 9.

(Written in the natural hand of Mrs. Waterhouse.)

I have certainly been acting a ridiculous part in confessing an unfortunate passion, which, whether I discover myself to you or not, can only raise contempt in your bosom towards a woman who has so far forgot what is due to herself. Twelve months since, how little would I have credited any human being who had said—'The day will come when you will make known to its object the guilty passion that now reigns in your bosom'; and yet in that short time what a sad, sad falling off from all those good, and consequently happy, feelings, I once possessed. But I know you are an impatient man, therefore I will now at once declare, that silly as was my writing to you, and without any end to be answered, except possessing a few lines from you, at the time I did it nothing could be farther from my intentions than ever letting you know from whom you have received that letter; and the second was written that I might avoid going to the ball, if you intended being there. Do not mortify me so much as to suppose that from what I said I was piqued at your not thinking me worth 'a second glance.' Oh! no; I have no claims to admiration; but, feeling as I do, I may have wished you had bestowed another on me. In that respect, I will be very candid, and tell you that, further than blue eyes and very white teeth, there is nothing to admire in me; and, knowing, that perhaps you will no longer be desirous of discovering my name, for I cannot agree with you in thinking that because my heart has chosen to bestow itself without your wish, or my consent, on you, that I or any other woman who is mean enough to make the first confession of her weakness is

likely to inspire 'real love' in a sensible man's bosom. Upon the most sacred promise of secrecy for ever on the subject, to every one, I may be induced to mention one circumstance that will, perhaps, assist your discovery—that is, if you wish it, after I have told you I live very retired, and shall, probably, continue to do so for a year or two; never receive or write a note or letter (except once a year) without a person seeing them who would not be pleased at seeing any from or to you; and, like a great many other women, do not live in Cheltenham. If you wish now to let our correspondence rest, only give me the assurance that the letters I have written, under the influence of an unfortunate and misguided passion, are no longer in existence, and have never been seen by any other eye than your own; for, from what a particular friend of yours has told me, I do indeed tremble. Excuse me if I say you are much deceived in a woman to whom you have given the credit of being able to keep a secret. I cannot at present direct you to any period for answering this, as I shall not be alone for some time.

London, May 9, 1819.

Now, my dear pen, be careful what you write; for I do not like to be called unkind by those I love and wish to please. Yes, a day is still an age in the annals of love; and it did sooth me, your saying for why you did not write on Thursday.

You thought I should be disappointed, and I am glad you told me you did think so; but women should never interfere in the thoughts of any one, when serious business is to be attended to; and much as I must regret having lost the happiness I sigh for, by my own folly, it is lessened by knowing that you said you would have been inconvenienced. Could I have wished such a thing, knowing that it would have proved that I loved myself better than I do you? Which do you think I love the best?—Do I feel sure I love you ardently? Do I feel sure that I exist? The one is as uncertain to me as the other. Must I again write? Think on what I have done, and never again say—'If you do love?' Oh! you provoking creature! You long to make me angry with you, but you shall not succeed. No; I cannot endure that you should be here and I not see you; but how, or where, is a great consideration. I think I could contrive it some morning. I might walk up that lane, but after rain it is impassable—or if you could think of any other spot, I would endeavour to meet you; but, at the same time, to meet you any where out of a customary walk, would, if I happened to be seen by any one, consign me for ever to disgrace; and that my proud and sensitive heart would not survive.

For the first time in my life I feel that I love—fondly, tenderly and affectionately love; and when I reflect upon every thing that has nursed that passion in my bosom, for an object so long only known to me by sights, I am convinced all exertions to conquer it would be striving against fate. And oh! it is a happiness so exquisite, such an indescribable passion, painfully pleasing, such an acute sensation of delightful agony, that I would not forego its soft pangs for any other bliss this life can afford. How much esteem two hearts often feel, for each other, and fancy it love, whereas scarcely one spark of that vivifying flame may animate either of their bosoms.

But there are hearts that will not be satisfied but by answering one of tenderness and love; and such a heart is mine. You may write once more; answer all these questions. Do you think I might venture to hear from you once a week, directed as when first I wrote to you, or once a fortnight, for the blank will be dreadful otherwise. Do you love music and poetry? and if you do, tell me something of both that you most admire, to charm away some weary hours. Do you admire *Lalla Rookh*?

"Oh! there are looks and tones that dart
An instant sunshine through the heart,
As if the soul that minute caught
Some treasure it through life had sought!"

And pray do tell me if we are to be gratified by an Amateur Play this month. Do write to-morrow, as Tuesday evening some one's return is positively fixed. I have just had a letter saying he will be here by eight o'clock. Farewell.

A Swiss Pickpocket.

C. Sunstrom, having the appearance of a Frenchman, was on Tuesday examined at Bow-street. This worthy had been taken into custody the night before at the Adelphi Theatre, on suspicion of being a pickpocket. On searching him no fewer than seven silk handkerchiefs were found in his hat, and his pockets were stowed with gloves, pocket-knives, bunches of keys, and snuff boxes, *ad infinitum!* In short, he appeared to be an excellent counterpart of the renowned *Filch*; certainly since the time of that celebrated professor of diving, no English *prig* was ever half so industrious. When this booby was discovered, proclamation of it was made in the theatre, and a whole host of prosecutors were instantly found. Of course the prisoner was fully committed for trial. He stated himself to be a native of Switzerland, residing in Crown-court, Pall-mall.

ASIATIC DEPARTMENT.

—255—

Bridges and Roads.

TOLLS PROPOSED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES, ROADS, AND SERAIAS.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

“England is to be sure” (in the words of the Edinburgh Reviewers) “a very expensive country; but a million of millions has been expended in making it habitable and comfortable; and this is a constant source of Revenue, or what is the same thing, a constant diminution of expence to every man living in it. The price an Englishman pays for a Turnpike Road is not equal to the tenth part of what the delay would cost him without a Turnpike. The New River Company brings water to every inhabitant of London at an infinitely less price than he could dip for it out of the Thames. No country, in fact, is so expensive as one which human beings are just beginning to inhabit; where there are no Roads, no Bridges, no skill, no help, no combination of powers, and no force of capital.”

What a striking portrait have we here of India! A short acquaintance even with the country must satisfy every Englishman how forcibly the latter paragraph delineates its comfortlessness and apathy, and the deplorable contrast the former affords to its condition. The few public works of general utility that the Mussulmauns performed, have long since fallen into decay; and had not the dominion of the British been established, happily for the people, all traces of them would ere now have been effaced. I do not however mean to assume a greater degree of merit than we deserve, and grant we have still much to do before Mr. Burke’s memorable animadversion can be removed; although I may safely assert at the same time under no preceding Administration have so many Bridges, Tanks, and Public Roads been constructed or repaired, Canals revived, desert Islands reclaimed, or Schools patronised; and I am convinced their extension throughout the Company’s territories is only bounded by the pecuniary means of Government. It consequently becomes every man’s duty to make known any method he thinks likely to obviate this hindrance to such important improvements for the notice of the proper Authorities. Upon this principle I take leave humbly to suggest the feasibility of repairing all the dilapidated Seraias (Inns) and Bridges; erecting others where most wanted; and collecting a light Toll from all who make use of them. These not only would prove a considerable accommodation and protection to Travellers, and Merchants especially, but aid the Police in the apprehension of Thieves, and to knowledge of suspicious persons: and yet these are trifling gains in comparison with the increased activity of Trade, which always follows a facilitated communication, and the additional Revenue Government would reap.

When last I travelled on the New Road between Calcutta and Benares, I was much astonished at seeing all the materials for a Bridge over the Caramnassa River, lying on its Banks, and no sign of the commencement of the work. Enquiring, I was told that the orthodox Hindoos having a prejudice against this stream, and being obliged to cross it on men’s shoulders, or in any other way to avoid touching its waters, some generous Mahratta Chief (the celebrated Nana Turnavesee, I believe,) moved with this inconvenience to the godly, also anxious perhaps to expiate his own crimes, began the Bridge; but he dying whilst the foundation was in progress, the work was abandoned, as it is held unlucky to carry on a Bridge (if not other Buildings likewise) in the execution of which a predecessor demised. Fortunately the British Government do not indulge in these mischievous vagaries, and might at little expence (the materials being in readiness) furnish the Bridge, making it by a Toll, a most unobjectionable source of Revenue, which would at least keep that part of the Military Road as well as the Bridge in repair: and pursuant to the admirable project of an Indian Officer published in your Journal of

the 28th of July last, for establishing steady Invalid Europeans on the New Road, one might be placed in charge of the Turnpike here.

Indeed there are many trust-worthy Veteran Serjeants, whose services are now totally lost, well qualified to fill subordinate appointments under the Magistrates and Collectors of Customs; and whose fidelity would prove both profitable to the State, and a great relief to the Inhabitants of Provinces from vexations and extortions *utterly incorrigible*, so long as a Native has any authority, which he can pervert to his advantage.

VIATOR.

Collision of Sentiments.

“Bless my sweet Masters, the old and the young
“From the gall of the heart, and the stroke of the tongue.”

BEN. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

My circumstances do not admit of my taking in a Newspaper; but I am indulged with a sight of “THE BULL” occasionally, and though of a cold temperament, and not easily roused, yet I must confess that I could not temperately get through the Letter of TOUCHSTONE of the 21st, without the desire of trying my mettle.

It is evidently written with a base intent; it is intended to rouse a feeling that would as evidently lead you to criminate yourself; or, in the event of that *silence*, which judgment and your own experience will dictate, the false touchstone as clearly intends to construe that into an acknowledgement of guilt!

Is this the man to talk of manliness and independence? Does he not know that we daily circulate that amongst our friends which, for manifold reasons, a delicacy of feeling towards others would prevent our making public? Has he never heard of the sacred rights of private intercourse? and will he tell us which of your friends he has thus betrayed? Did he never hear of the “Rape of the Hat?” and does he think its Author wanting in manliness or independence of spirit because it was circulated and not published?

We ought never to forget that every thing made by the hands of man comes slowly to that perfection which God has permitted. Nothing comes out of them perfect, but arrives by slow degrees to maturity. Do we not live under a *new* Government? a Government in its infancy; and its august Ruler with all its public Functionaries could tell us that its wheels are daily clogged, and evils hourly discovered, which time only and experience can remedy? Your sentiments and opinions, Sir, are derived from, and therefore better calculated for, an *older* state; but they are not consequently injurious to *this*: on the contrary, they *must* lead us more rapidly to perfection than if they were suppressed.

I am not for advocating sudden changes—I love obedience to the powers that be, and enjoin it; but if oppressed, I would appeal and vindicate my conduct; and if I failed not in the attempt, it would be intolerance to condemn me unanswered. In this case, I would appeal from Government to my friends, nay even to the world, (if it would not hurt the interests of my family); for I hold the character of every man to be of value, and even if contumacious by the State, that it is not of the less consequence to society and to himself!

Even Rogues will form to themselves a Government, and (by degrees) an efficient one. Philip had his *Πονηροδοτες*, and we have had our Rogues’ towns; and what better was mighty Rome herself? Let TOUCHSTONE tell us how they became *good* Governments, and if Free Discussion was suppressed amongst them?

Yours,

PINCHBECK.

Barrackpore, Sept. 23, 1821.

Something in Self-Defence.

That the *Hurkaru* or *John Bull*, or any of their Readers or Patrons, should approve of *any thing* done by the object of their bitterest hatred, and constant vituperation, is not, of course to be expected: indeed all who read these Papers, look as naturally for the stated portion devoted to the *Journal*, as to the column of Births, Deaths, or any other department of intelligence; and they seldom look in vain. The weight that is attached to such sweeping and comprehensive opposition to all we say or do, is, however, very little; for the cry has been too long continued, and too indiscriminately used to deceive any reflecting or impartial persons. To these, therefore, any thing in reply, from us, would be useless;—but as it happens that there are in all communities understandings that cannot penetrate beneath the surface, and are unreflectingly caught by the most specious assertions, it may be well now and then, for us to say a word or two when necessary to undeceive them. If the *Journal* were read *only* by the first class to which we have alluded, tho' these we are persuaded form the great bulk of its supporters, it would be an offence to their understandings to waste our time and space on the present Controversy;—but it is clear that the *Journal* is read with the greatest avidity by those who affect to despise it most heartily. *John Bull*, for instance, who once pretended that “*the Journal* was never laid before him,” and made this his excuse for silence, has now changed this as well as others of his principles, and evidently reads its pages regularly and carefully throughout, unless it be supposed that he becomes intuitively acquainted with the parts that offend him most, and which he so carefully selects for comment and re-publication. His Correspondents too, who direct their chief attention to us, while they contend that the *Journal* should be discarded from every honest man’s house, take excellent care to have a sly and quiet perusal of it in some snug corner of their own; tho' they would not contribute to the “guilty profit” of its Editor by paying for the same, as this would be far a more heinous sin than reading it gratuitously. And as to the *Hurkaru*, and its Correspondents, they evidently pore over its pages with an eagerness of interest and anxiety, which is seen in every comment they get up to decry its contents. It is to readers of this class, then, who challenge and defy, and raise an outcry about a “pest” and a “nuisance,” which no man is obliged to be annoyed with unless he chooses, and which, if it were half so contemptible and silly, and self-refuting, as they pretend, would never have become so obnoxious to them—that the few following remarks, on the Letter of C— in the *Hurkaru*, and the observations of *John Bull* of Saturday are offered:—

C— complains that Transmission is a worn-out subject:—he blames us for perpetually introducing it;—and he believes that we desire to be transmitted, for the sake of *eclat*. We reply that we should be glad to learn that Transmission was so effectually worn-out, as that it would not bear being brushed up again. It is not correct, however, to attribute its perpetual introduction to ourselves. The nameless Writer in the *Government Gazette*, who was afterwards called *SIR ORACLE*, was the first that professed to advocate it. After him we have had sundry Writers whose Signatures we forget, defending it in the *Hurkaru* under its former Editor; and then *PERDICCAS*, *VINDEX*, and others in *John Bull*. It is hardly fair to say that the Liberty of Discussion should be all on one side, be the subject what it may; and as long as such Writers were freely permitted to defend this power, and even recommend its being exercised on us, we think if any body has a right to protest against it, and to make it matter of discussion, it is the individual against whom its shafts were directed:—if it interests any one, it must naturally interest him. But it was never taken up as a personal or individual question: since it was not the power to Transport the Editor of the *Calcutta Journal* without Trial, that was called in question, but the power to transport *any one* for offences through the Press, against which the Law fully provided; and it is clear, that since *Ram Mohun Roy* could not be so transported for his Pamphlets, nor *Mr. White* of the *Gazetteer* Press for his Publication, nor *Mr. Rozario* of our own for the *Journal*, nor indeed

any other Native of India, to whom we might think fit to transfer the Editorship to-morrow, the power can never be effectually used to destroy the Freedom of the Press; though it certainly might be used for the purpose of removing all the present English Editors of India, whose places would soon be filled by a set of Native-born Editors, less informed, perhaps, than even *John Bull* and the *Hurkaru*, on English affairs, but far more competent, and far more likely to agitate the affairs of this country, which the Government could no more prevent them from doing thro' the Press, than they could prevent their discussing them as they now do in their private dwellings. If the Government desire such a change, nothing is more easy to effect; but it depends entirely on them whether it will ever take place or not.

C— doubts the fact of the Court of Proprietors being *unanimous* in their opinion of the value of a Free Press in India. Let him consult the *Asiatic Journal* for May, to be had at all the Book Shops in Town, and he will see that not a single voice in the whole Court expressed a contrary opinion.

He says, we confuse the subject of Transmission, by mixing it with the Freedom of the Press, and that we misrepresent our Opponents when we insinuate that any one of them has ever said that Summary Transportation without Trial was a more fit and appropriate way of treating offences through the Press in India, than the wholesome correction of a British Court and a British Jury. As to the first charge, the “confusion” did not originate with us, but with those who recommended Transmission as a punishment for offences through the Press, and those who still recommend it; and as to the second, we refer C— to the Letters of *SIR ORACLE*, to *PERDICCAS*, to *VINDEX*, and to all the tribe who have perpetually contended that the Journalist should have been sent away long ago; tho' no crimes have yet been laid to his charge except that of abusing the Freedom of the Press. If it were not considered a better check on the Press than a British Jury, why should its advocates recommend it or defend it at all? they would not surely replace the one unless by something that they held to be better. This is therefore to be fairly inferred from their defence of it.

C— says—Either the power of removing any individual from this country at the discretion of its Governors, is legal or it is not so. But, he adds, no one as yet ventured to say it is not legal. We refer him to the Letters of *Noxos*, in which this is asserted in reference to cases of Libel, and the reasons on which such assertion is made are given at length.

C— goes on—“I shall not at present enter into any defence of the policy or necessity of such a power; it is sufficient for my present purpose that this power does legally exist in the Heads of Government, without regard to the precise nature of the misconduct. It reaches to all descriptions of misbehaviour, which may in their estimation require so strong a measure.”—It is this very circumstance which renders such a power so objectionable; because it is clear from this that any man might be transported and ruined for *any description* of misbehaviour—for instance, for making an awkward bow, on his first appearance at a levee—for having his coat cut in too fashionable a shape, for having a longer nose than was compatible with the standard of legitimate proportions—for not being susceptible of some fair lady’s charms—or for any other defect or misbehaviour which the whim, or caprice, or fancy, or fears, of the “Heads of a Government” might deem objectionable. The right to “Freedom of Publication” is acknowledged even by *Lord Castlereagh* to belong to every Englishman, subject only to the punishment accorded by the Trial by Jury. The “Freedom of Publication” was regarded by *Lord Hastings* as the natural right of all his fellow-subjects. So also is the right of walking, or of riding, or of speaking, or of dressing, or of sleeping, or of living; they all belong to Englishmen, and all rest upon the same footing—and no power can more justly deprive a man of the one than of the other. Each of these rights belong to us, however, as our very existence does, under the restrictions of British Law. We may print freely, but if we are guilty of Libel we are punished; we may walk freely, but if we walk over the “parterre” of another and destroy all his

Monday, September 24, 1821.

—257—

“sweet flowers” we must make restitution;—we may speak freely, but if we slander our neighbours, we may be made to pay damages;—we may dress freely, but we must take care not to put on another man’s apparel;—we may sleep freely, but if we select the wife of another for the companion of our bed, we shall be punished as adulterers;—we may live freely, as long as our existence does not endanger the lives and properties of our fellow men. But who is the Judge of all these delinquencies, and what power can deprive us of each and of all these natural rights? Not the Secretary of the Home Department: not the Cabinet Ministers: not the whole Parliament assembled: not even the King himself—No—The *only* Tribunal is that of the Law, and a British Jury—and the whole spirit and essence of that Law is directed to destroy such a “monster in jurisprudence,” as a discretionary and arbitrary power of Criminal Equity, having only “private and conscientious responsibility” as C—— terms it, or responsibility to Public Opinion, and Future Character.

The little likelihood of any power being abused, and the security to be found in the honor and integrity of those vested with it, are arguments that would be plausible if the power were never to pass from the hands of its present possessors. But when they leave us, who knows what Tyrants may succeed? It is in the nature of discretionary power to seduce the holder of it; and History furnishes abundant proofs of good men being rendered bad by this means alone. Our own happy Constitution, as C. admits, is founded on a very opposite maxim; but it is not mere responsibility to Public Opinion or Future Character that is binding on all men in power even there (many of whom despise these vulgar bonds), but responsibility to the Laws, which are above all, and to which the King as well as his subjects must bow in submission.

C—— says that offences through the Press require a stronger remedy than any other, because they extend their influence farther:—Be it so. Let the *Law* provide the distinct remedy, and we shall yield implicit obedience to its dictates;—but if *Discretion* be the source of such remedy, who shall be safe? Those who flatter the possessors of it may go unpunished, but he who dares to speak his honest sentiments may not; and yet, which of these is the most estimable, let the testimony of Lord Hastings decide; who refers us to the triumphs of our own beloved Country over tyrant-ridden France, for a proof of the value of that spirit to be found only in men accustomed to indulge and express their honest sentiments.

We differ from C——, who thinks offences through the Press to be greater than any other. On the contrary, we hold that offences *against* the Press are far more heinous; and that the imposition of a Censorship would be regarded, in England, as a far more flagrant offence against Justice than the most infamous Libel that ever was published. Offences *through* the Press can be punished by the Law, which is alone competent to decide on what constitutes such offence. If it come not up to the standard of criminality required for legal cognizance, it can be refuted and corrected through the Press itself. But the imposition of a Censorship is a crime against the human race; and perpetrated as it is in secret and by those who have the power in their hands, it cannot be remedied through the Press: so that by such a step the world might be robbed of more useful information, more valuable opinion, and the liberties of mankind be more effectually paralysed than by the libels of a thousand Presses, conducted on the most licentious principles. If Experience or History be of any weight, let the advocates for restraining the Freedom of Opinion look at the relative condition of England and America, as compared with Syria, Egypt, and Persia. In the two former, the latest civilized portions of the habitable earth, all that can ennoble and dignify humanity is to be found; and in the aggregate there is more of virtue, knowledge, liberty, and happiness, than in any other countries on earth. In the three latter, which were resplendent in the splendour of their greatness, and had fallen in the wreck of ancient kingdoms, before either England or America were numbered among the nations of the earth, there is more of vice, ignorance, slavery, and misery, than is to be found in any countries perhaps on the globe. In England and America the Press is Free,

and subject only to the Laws of the Country, and to the decisions of a Jury. Discretionary power to banish, or transport, or otherwise punish for misbehaviour, is unknown. In Turkey and Persia, however, there is no Press, no Jury, and the discretionary power of the Sultan is absolute. *He* can do no wrong:—and he not only *can*, but *does* punish misbehaviour by Transportation without Trial, almost every day of his life. One man misbehaves by having a prettier wife or daughter than his neighbours: *he* is transported to the Caucasus, and the wife or daughter transplanted to the *Haram*. Another misbehaves by having a larger fortune than is agreeable to the Sovereign: *he* is transported to the other world, and his charter-party passage saved by the exercise of the bowstring, and his houses, lands, and wealth transferred to the Royal domain.

These are the blessed fruits of a discretionary power to punish offences without the intervention of Courts and Juries; and this power is exercised too, as C—— would have it done here, namely, under a responsibility to Public Opinion and Future Character: sometimes indeed, the said Public Opinion surrounds the Tyrant’s Castle, and plants a thousand daggers in his detested heart, while his future character is consigned to infamy. But this does not deter his successor; because if one falls a victim to the excesses of his cruelty, nine escape by entrenching themselves deeply amid their armed bands; and no man is weak enough to suspect that he is to be the tenth who may fall.

C—— says “the necessity of a greater restriction on the Press in this country than in England is so obvious, that it is scarce necessary to say a word on it; but should it be denied, I hold myself ready to maintain that it is desirable, and that in taking off the Censorship, Government never intended to yield up all controul, but to open a field for the fair and liberal discussion of all and every subject, *except those which could neither tend to private advantage or public good.*” We do deny the necessity of a greater restriction on the European Press here than at home, and shall be glad to hear the arguments by which C—— maintains the contrary; for assertions will not do. Before he enters on his task, we would recommend him, however, to study particularly well the Speeches of Mr. Ferguson on several occasions here; those at the Meeting to address Lord Hastings at Madras; the Reply of the Noble Lord himself; the admirable Papers on the Freedom of the Press in the *Friend of India*; the Letters of A NEAR OBSERVER, and those of HORATIO and NOMOS, in the *Calcutta Journal*; with sundry other documents on this subject, which will take him a month at least to read, perhaps a year to understand, but which if he hopes, not merely to decry, but fairly to refute, it will require a longer life than that of an ordinary man to accomplish. If the Government when they took off the Censorship, did not, as C—— asserts, intend to yield up all controul (tho’ we know not unless he be a Member of that Body, how he can know more of their intentions than other people)—so much the more the pity;—because it is clear that in the Meeting at Madras, in the Council at Bombay, in the Government House at Calcutta, in the Parliament at home, and in the India House also, it was clearly and unequivocally understood that the Government did intend to yield up all controul but those of the Laws; to which they themselves had recourse for protection, when the offensive Letter of EMULUS was directed against the use of patronage. If they did not intend to yield up that discretionary controul which the Censorship gave them—and which its removal took away,—then all that has been spoken and written on this subject in England and in India is useless, if it be not liable to even a worse suspicion. But we doubt the accuracy of C——’s information—we believe the Government did originally, fairly, and honestly intend all it said and did regarding the *Emancipation* of the Indian Press; and that whatever symptoms of a contrary feeling may have since been displayed, have been drawn forth by irritations, and scoffs, and goadings, and intreaties, and appeals to them for the exercise of their power, which ought to have been made to the Law; and that in the conflicting embarrassments of a strong desire to do what they considered beneficial, but at the same time, an equally strong desire not to violate the spirit and essence, though they might be borne out by the letter of the

Law, they have seemed to countenance a restraint upon the Press which is utterly at variance with its Freedom; and their pretended friends, but real enemies, have only contributed to render that embarrassment apparently still greater than it ought really to be considered.

When C— contends that the field is open for the discussion of all subjects; "except those which can neither tend to private advantage or public good," he forgets that there is no subject *whatever* but that the person broaching it conceives either for his private advantage or for public good;—Of this who is to be the Judge?—We say, a British Court and British Jury: C— says, the Heads of Government. We ask which is best? If the former, we have then the advantage of known laws, fixed penalties, and the certainty of impartial judgement:—If the latter, we have uncertain laws or rather none, ruinous and arbitrary penalties, and the chance of a most partial judgement;—because, it is hardly presumed that any other discussion than that in which the Government were a party would be prevented or punished by the Heads of Government; and no man can be supposed to be an impartial Judge in his own cause.

C— says, "I beg that the Journal, if he deigns to notice this Letter, will not descend on this occasion to his usual mode of defence: viz. that of abuse of his Opponent, but that he will at once meet the Challenge fairly. First, (he continues,) I say that the power of Transmission is legally invested in the Heads of the Government, and that such a power is politic and necessary—Secondly, That the exercise of that power is as just and proper against offences through the Press as any other: and indeed most likely to be required in that case, whenever an Individual, so far forgets himself in the conduct of a Publication as to render it the vehicle of articles religiously, morally, and politically reprehensible."

It is constantly assumed by those with whom we contend in argument, that our usual mode of defence is abuse. Let the readers of this Paper determine for themselves whether we give or receive most of this commodity, and whether it is not a convenient term constantly assumed on the part of our adversaries whenever they are beaten in argument. The existence of the power of Transmission no man doubts, any more than he doubts the power of the Government to send a man to Siberia instead of England. The Sepoys that could drag on Englishmen on board a chartered Ship in the River, could also escort him in chains across the Himalyah; but the Judges of the Supreme Court, the Guardians of the Law, who were sent to India near 50 years ago for the declared purpose of seeing Justice administered within the Town of Calcutta, would not for any offensive publication brought before them, condemn the offender either to the one or the other; and no true friend of the British name in India, could desire to see any other Authority exercise a power which the Judges of the Land were not empowered to exert. Whether we ever forget ourselves so far as to publish articles that are religiously, morally, and politically reprehensible, it is not for us to say. If they are offences against the Law, let the Law be exercised; but with all the respect that we unfeignedly entertain for the present Government in India, we do not think that either in religion, in morals, or in politics, they would ever desire that any man should be bound exactly by the standard of their own opinions, or in other words, that they should have the power of punishing whatever they might deem reprehensible in either. If these were to be made the subjects of their enquiry and punishment, they would find Infidels who scoff at Religion, Fornicators and Adulterers who defy Morality, and men of all shades and hues in Politics, among the present mixed population of Calcutta, which would give them employment enough; but they wisely leave the punishment of these offences to the Laws, to which we desire to see all men equally subject.

The remainder of C—'s Letter contains little that requires comment. He says, "If the fetters of the Press have been broken; why does he complain of being restricted; and if they have not been broken, why does he say they have?" We do not complain of being restricted; we say the fetters *have* been broken; and we say there are slavish spirits that wish to rivet them again; but we tell them that they will never succeed; and we express our belief that the Censorship will never be restored. We do still say, that

the Liberator of the Indian Press is *illustrious, great, and honored*, and none say with more sincerity than ourselves; chiefly, because we believe that he would not unjustly use his power as others are constantly invoking him to do. As far as the exercise of such power is unconditional, or dependant on mere discretion, every man against whom it is directed is *unarmed*. In a Court of Law, indeed, rectitude of intention is a shield; but in the hold of a chartered ship it is none. In the former too, an able counsel and a just cause are defensive weapons; but in the latter they are of no avail. We are therefore in such a case, in the eye of the law, completely *unarmed*: we are *unoffending* also, in the eye of the law; for in its sight all men are deemed innocent until a Jury of their countrymen shall find them guilty: and we are *unresisting*, as far as the law or the orders of the Government are concerned; for we have hitherto never resisted either the one or the other, but confined ourselves to opposing the unjust aspersions, combatting the false reasoning, and defending ourself from the attacks of enemies. If we are to be put down for these, let the attackers and defenders fall together, and be mingled in one common wreck: but while the other Prints of the Presidency are suffered to use the utmost freedom in contending for their opinions, and using every means of taunt and defiance within their reach, we only ask for ourselves the fair exercise of the same privilege, that we may combat on equal grounds, and leave the issue to that Public Opinion on which our very Empire in the East is declared to be founded, and on which more particularly all who are connected with the Press must be wholly dependant for existence and support.

Duty of Public Officers.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

Many of your Subscribers may never have met with the following Instruction, issued by Mr. Beecher, the Resident at the Durbar in Bengal, in the year 1769, to the Company's Covenanted Servants, deputed into the Districts of Bengal, to act in subordination to him as Local Supervisor over the Native Officers employed in the collection of the Revenue and administration of Justice; and which Instruction, being applicable to all Public Officers employed in similar situations, I request that you will give the Exhortation of Mr. Beecher, a place in your truly useful and widely circulating Journal.

"Your Commission entrusts you with the Superintendence and Charge of a Province, whose rise and fall must considerably affect the public welfare of the whole. The exploring and eradicating numberless oppressions, which are so grievous to the poor as they are injurious to the Government; the displaying of those national principles of honour, faith, rectitude, and humanity, which should ever characterise the name of an Englishman; the impressing the lowest individual with these ideas, and raising the heart of the Ryot from oppression and despondency to security and joy, are the valuable benefits which must result to our nation from a prudent and wise behaviour on your part. Versed as you are in the Language, depend on none, where you yourself can possibly hear and determine. Let access to you be easy, and be careful of conduct of your dependents. Aim at no undue influence yourself, and check it in all others. A great share of integrity, disinterestedness, assiduity, and watchfulness, is necessary, not only for your own guidance, but as an example to all others, for your activity and advice will be in vain unless confirmed by example. Carefully avoid all interested views by commerce, or otherwise, in the Province, whilst on this Service; for, though ever so fair and honest, it will awaken the attention of the designing; double the labour of developing stratagems; and of removing burthens and discouragements with which the commerce of the country in general has been loaded. You have before you a large field to establish both a national and private character; lose not the opportunity, which is to be temporary only, for your whole proceedings will be quickly revised; a test which the Board considers due to themselves, as a confirmation of the propriety of their choice; to you, as an act of Justice to your conduct; and to the Public, for the security of its interests."

June 1821. AN ADMIRER OF SUCH SENTIMENTS.

Monday. September 24, 1821.

—259—

Sacred Pastoral.

"Come away. For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land."

SOL. SONG 2. 10, 11, 12.

Come away to the sweet-breathing fields!
The gloom of the winter is past;
No longer the rude torrents deluge the vale,
Nor howls thro' the wood the cold blast.
Come away to the sweet-breathing fields!
And watch the first blush of the rose,
While the sun in his youth with a gold glowing beam
Paints his bow on the storm as it goes.
The new bursting bud of the flower
On the lap of the blossoming heath,
Unbosoms in fragrance the lurking vermicel
And scatters its odorous breath.
The loveliest birth of the Spring
Hangs lightly its star-cluster'd head,
And blooming to meet its own image below
It bends o'er the water-cress bed.
Escap'd from imprisoning bulbs,
The hyacinth's succulent spears
Bright wave to the wind, and the delicate flow'r,
Pale blushing, its pyramid rears.
The sorrowing yellow-fringed eye
Of the narcissus on the lone wold,
Retains the fresh dew like a sun-shiny tear,
Or a diamond sparkling in gold.
O, charm'd by the onsel's deep song
Come away to the sweet breathing fields!
The violet, that slept in its vernal recess,
Its balm to the solitude yields.
When silent the watercourse rolls,
All luscious abroad on the plain,
The crumpled geranium in wildness reveals
To the desert its dark ruby stain.
Come away to the sweet-breathing fields!
Or to the thick' forest repair,
For the wood-bird now warbles her tremulous hymn,
And the voice of the turtle is there;
Nor at night is the wilderness mute
While the moon climbs her mountainous way;
The nightingale sings to the murmuring gales
Till the dubious dawn of the day.
Thou wayfaring man, come away!
The clouds of thy winter retire;
The morn of thy glory casts o'er the wide heavens
The blaze of ethereal fire.
Eternity rolls on thy view,
The light of ineffable day;
Then rise from the gloom of thy sorrowful night,
O, wayfaring man, come away!"

Calcutta, Written in 1820.

CYTHON.

* "The cold weather is not supposed by Solomon to have been long over, since it is distinctly mentioned, and the inhabitants of Aleppo make their excursions very early. The narcissus flowers during the whole of the murbania; hyacinths and violets at latest before it is quite over: the appearing of flowers then does not mean the appearing of the first and earliest flowers, but must rather be understood of the earth's being covered with them, which at Aleppo is not till after the middle of February, a small crane's-bill (geranium) appearing on the banks of the river there about the middle of February, quickly after which comes a profusion of flowers. The nightingales which are there in abundance, not only afford much pleasure by their songs in the gardens, but are also kept tame in the houses, and let out at a small rate to divert such as choose it in the city, so that no entertainments are made in the spring without a concert of these birds; no wonder then that Solomon makes the Bridegroom speak of the singing of birds."—Harmer's *Observations on various passages of Scripture*.—Vol. I. page 69, 61.

Native Police Officers.

"I would humbly request that a few Copies of the several Government Regulations, in the several Languages in which they are published, may be given to the School for Class Books, by which means a knowledge of what is cognizable by Law, would gradually become known among the Scholars, and that in many instances crimes be prevented, and also any tendency to exceed the orders of Government in the lower classes of Government Servants be counteracted."—(Raja Joynarin's Letter to the Governor General's Agent at Benares, dated November 26, 1818.)

To the Editor of the *Calcutta Journal*.

SIR,

It is not possible to peruse the excellent Discourse delivered by the Marquis of Hastings at the last College Disputations without a full assurance of the severe reprehension that the practice would incur, if known to his Lordship, which is assumed by nearly all the Native Police Officers of refusing to give copies of, or even to shew the Government Orders sent for their guidance, and no doubt likewise for the information of all whom they affect,

Their motive for concealment is glaring: viz. that if the Laws were commonly understood, and the extent of a Police Officer's authority ascertained, he would seldom succeed in terrifying the people into submission to his venality by asserting, "if he refer the complaint against them to the Magistrate (who probably resides 3, 4, or 5 days journey off) their disgrace and ruin are infallible."

Only yesterday a respectable Native asked me how he could provide himself with a True Copy of the Regulations of Government, that he might know himself and tell his family and neighbours what was legal and what illegal,—since they none of them at present had aught but the Tanahdar's 'ipse dixit', which few believed was always *impartial*. The Tanahdar, he added, had decisively refused, nay resented his request to take a Copy of the public printed Regulations lodged in his hands, pretending he durst not, as it was contrary to his instructions!

It will not appear perhaps altogether irrelevant if I say a word or two on the extensive loss to Government as well as excessive hardship to the agricultural inhabitants, resulting from the Tikhadar or Farming System. By this system the Ryots are ground down to the most miserable penury, not for the benefit of the State (temporarily it only could be,) but to enrich the Tikhadar or Middleman, and to corrupt the Government Tehsildars, Aumeens, &c. &c. whose interest and notorious habit it is to deceive the Collector in the valuation and measurement of the Lands under his charge. An instance not many days ago was, in secrecy, communicated to me by a perfectly unbiased person, of a certain village, (naming it,) which yields just one-fourth to the British Government of what the Tikhadar receives. Every honest and well informed Native will admit the vast advantages which Government and the Ryots alike would experience in the abolition of not only all Tikhadars, but of every species of intervening Native Authority, as Zamindars, Mukkudemahs, &c. who at best but play the odious part of drones amongst the bees, and steadfastly discourage all improvements from a fear of losing their petty *feudal* sway.

The appointment of Kanoongoes, or Registers of Title Deeds, &c., is certainly founded in utility; though the existing race, I am afraid, help more to perplex than elucidate, and in other ways do more harm than good.

ALFRED.

BANK OF BENGAL RATES.

Discount on Private Bills,.....	6 per cent.
Ditto on Government Bills of Exchange,.....	4 per cent.
Interest on Loans on Deposit,.....	4 per cent.
Bank Shares—Premium,.....	29 a 30 per cent.

Note.—There is now a difference of about one per cent. on Remittable Paper of 1813-14, and the later Loans, in the above the medium is taken.

Chain Cables.

No autor ultra crepidam!
Let not a cobler go beyond his last!

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

Sir,

The Writer of the Letter on Chain Cables which appeared in your Journal of yesterday, is no doubt a very clever fellow, (in his own imagination, at least) but his manner of shewing it is rather awkward. He sets out with the avowed object of proving the superiority of Chain over Hemp Cables; but in his eagerness to display the extent of his knowledge in the management of them, he entirely loses sight of this object, and instead of stating the advantages of these iron securities, proceeds to prove, that without "extreme care" they are liable to occasion accidents that can never be produced by Hemp Cables. But as we are not all so clever or so "extremely careful" as your Correspondent, or like him so desirous of shewing off our nautical skill, as to wish to encounter unnecessary difficulties, by way of putting it to the proof, I rather think his recommendation is not likely to produce the desired effect.

I am quite aware of the advantages which Chain Cables possess over Hemp in some respects, though your Correspondent has in a most extraordinary manner omitted to mention one of them: I shall therefore do this for him. These advantages are then as follows: viz. 1st they can be let go in rocky ground; 2dly they stow in infinitely less compass than Hemp Cables; 3dly they stow themselves, merely requiring to be paid down off the deck. But with all these recommendations there is an insuperable objection to their general use here. In rivers like the Thames where the tide is moderate they answer very well; but here in the Ganges where in the flurries the current runs at the rate of 9 and 10 knots, ships after taking a broad sheer frequently forge a-head, and bring their Cables athwart the forefoot. In this case if the Cable be a Chain, the nip is so dead that the stem will in all probability be seriously injured, if not entirely wrung off. Several accidents of this kind have occurred: one in particular that happened about two years ago, I distinctly remember: a large Free Trader after having been here six or nine months waiting for a cargo, at length obtained one and was to drop down on the day succeeding that, on which the accident occurred. She was lying in the stream when a flurry caught her and her stem was nearly wrung off in the manner above described; besides which before she got clear, she was lying some time in a most dangerous position with one gunwale in the water. At this very time too, there are several ships in the river that have suffered in the stem from the use of Chain Cables, and your Correspondent has himself shewn that they are very liable to break the Anchor. It is evident I think from all this, that though it may be advisable to have one Chain Cable aboard, it would be highly injudicious to suffer them to supersede entirely the use of Hemp Cables here. So much for the comparative merits of Hemp and Iron:—I now proceed to notice the remainder of your Correspondent's Letter.

In the first place I must observe, that the recommendation of Chain Cables, though it take the lead in your Correspondent's communication, by the very short space devoted to it, seems to have been entirely secondary to his wish to enlighten by his instructions, the benighted brethren of his profession in India. They will all, no doubt, in common with myself feel much obliged by his intention; but I rather apprehend they may, as I do, entertain some doubts, whether the power to do good in this instance equals the will. Your Correspondent talks a great deal about *canting* the Anchor in tending. I confess I do not know what he means by this; for as I understand the matter, a Ship's Anchor is not *canted* except when it is fouled, but is what is technically called *winded*, or as Mr. Taylor (the author from whom some of his remarks appear to be derived) more clearly expresses it, is *drawn round*, and not upset right over end as is implied by "canting." I pass over the mention of the accidents likely to arise from not *canting* (which I will charitably suppose is meant for not *winding*) the Anchor in tending, and come now to the paragraph in which the Writer speaks of Mr. Taylor's Work.

In allusion to this book, your Correspondent says, "I strongly recommend it to the young Seaman in India. In the mean time, however, I have to observe, that the most simple and the safest method to keep a clear Anchor is to lay the Ship to *LEEWARD* of her anchor with a small sheer (if the anchoring ground or sufficient room will admit) keeping the jib or Foretopmast stay-sail set with the sheet to windward;" &c.—Now Sir, mark what Mr. Taylor of North Shields, the very author recommended in this very paragraph (and from whom some of your Correspondent's remarks are evidently derived) says on this subject. "Riding in a tide-way with a fresh wind, the ship should have what is called a short or windward service of 45 or 50 fathoms of cable and be *ALWAYS SHEERED TO WINDWARD* &c." and in a note upon this Mr. Taylor adds "It has been thought by some Theorists that ships should be sheered to leeward of their anchors

but experience and the common practice of the best informed seamen are against that opinion &c." Whether your Correspondent be or be not, one of the description of Theorists Mr. Taylor had in his mind's eye, when he wrote the sentence in question I shall not pretend to decide; but certainly the whole letter throughout does smell rather strong of theory; and I incline to the opinion that it will not suffice to convince the seamen of India that the writer is a man of sufficient practical knowledge to be capable of becoming their instructor.—At all events the circumstance of his recommending a practice, in direct opposition to that advised by the author he himself sets up as a guide,—will not have a tendency to create in the minds of the readers of his production, that favorable opinion of his talents which he seems himself so complaisantly to entertain.—I suspect he has got out of his depth, and in future he had better attend to the advice conveyed in my motto.

I am, Sir, your's obediently,

Howrah, Sept. 22, 1821.

WEATHER SHEER.

Shipping Departures.

CALCUTTA.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	Destination
Sept. 21	La Zelie Eugenie	French	Le Gallais	Bourbon

List of Shipping in Madras Roads on the 4th of September, 1821.

His Majesty's Sloop *Satellite*, Captain A. L. Corry,—His Majesty's Sloop *Sophie*, Captain George French,—Ship *Edward Stretton*, Captain William Balston,—Ship *Humayun Shah*, Nacodah A. B. Hussan,—Ship *Futta Moobaruck*, Nacodah Agamud ben Mahomed,—Brig *Ariel*, Captain J. F. Fisk,—Brig *Catherine*, Captain Robert Gibson,—Brig *Ceylon*, Captain L. M. Hansey.

Administrations to Estates.

Lieutenant Colonel George Mason, late on the Honorable Company's Bengal Military Establishment, deceased—Captain James Tennant.

Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Beaumont, widow, deceased—David Clark, Esq.

Mr. Joseph Lyent, late an Indigo Planter, deceased—David Clark, Esq.

Commercial Reports.

(From the Calcutta Exchange Price Current of Thursday last.)

Exports from Calcutta from the 1st to the 31st of August, 1821.

Sugar, to London,	bazar maunds	1691
Liverpool,		2177
Saltpetre, to London,		14294
Liverpool,		3107
Greenock,		452
Dry Ginger, to London,		153
Piece Goods, to London,	pieces	1982
Liverpool,		1583
Silk, to London,	bazar maunds	199
Indigo, to London,	factory maunds	1283
Liverpool,		17

Military Arrivals and Departures.

Weekly List of Military Arrivals at, and Departures from, the Presidency.

Arrivals.—Major J. F. Dundas, Artillery Regiment, from Allahabad,—Captain J. Anderson, 27th Regiment of Native Infantry, from Europe,—Captain A. Lomas, 2d Battalion 12th Regiment of Native Infantry, ditto,—Surgeon J. H. Mackenzie, 24th Regiment of Native Infantry, ditto,—Cavalry Cadet J. F. Bradford, ditto,—Infantry Cadet R. H. Miles, ditto,—Infantry Cadet B. Boswell, ditto,—Infantry Cadet S. Williams, ditto.

Departures.—Captain J. Tennant, M. B. Field Artillery, to Cawnpore,—Assistant Surgeon A. Pringle, ditto.

Birth.

On the 22d instant, the Lady of JOHN HUNTER, Esq. of the Civil Service, of a Daughter.